

EXHIBIT C

MDOC Prisoner Step III Grievance Report

May 2009 to Present

Inmate Number

202475

Last Name

Swift

First Name

Keith

Step III Rec'd	Grievance Identifier	Grievance Category	Facility	Step I Received Date	Resolved	Partially Resolved	Denied	Rejected	Closed	Date Mailed
X	2/28/2016	LCF-16-11-0931-12D1	12D1	16	11/2/2016	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2/28/2017

Notes:

X	2/26/2014	JCF-14-01-0186-12d3	12d3	12	1/22/2014	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4/24/2014
---	-----------	---------------------	------	----	-----------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------

Notes:

4/9/2012	URF-12-02-0656-12d3	12d3		2/22/2012	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6/20/2012
----------	---------------------	------	--	-----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------

Notes:

4/9/2012	URF-12-02-0654-12d3	12d3		2/22/2012	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6/20/2012
----------	---------------------	------	--	-----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------

Notes:

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Page 1 of 2



MDOC Prisoner Step III Grievance Report

May 2009 to Present

Inmate Number

202475

Last Name

Swift

First Name

Keith

Step III Rec'd	Grievance Identifier	Grievance Category	Facility	Step I Received Date	Resolved	Partially Resolved	Denied	Rejected	Closed	Date Mailed
11/4/2011	NCF-11-09-1008-17a	17a		9/29/2011	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1/11/2012

Notes:

11/4/2011	NCF-11-09-1005-17a	17a		9/28/2011	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1/11/2012
-----------	--------------------	-----	--	-----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------

Notes:

9/30/2011	NCF-11-08-0922-28k	28k		8/26/2011	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11/10/2011
-----------	--------------------	-----	--	-----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------

Notes:

7/8/2010	LRF-10-04-0566-07a	07a		4/12/2010	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8/7/2010
----------	--------------------	-----	--	-----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------

Notes:

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Page 2 of 2

Step III Grievance Response

KEITH SWIFT

202475

LCF 16110931

Grievant alleges he is inappropriately being denied access to a colostomy reversal in efforts to save funding.


All relevant information within the electronic medical record has been reviewed. Step I and Step II appropriately addressed this grievance and are affirmed at the Step III appeal. Grievant continues to be assessed, monitored, and treated as determined medically and clinically indicated by Qualified Health Care Professionals. Disagreement is not support for the allegations contained within this grievance.

Grievance appeal denied.

Response of Bureau of Health Care Services

Date: 2/2/2017

Approved: _____


R. Harbaugh, RN

Date: 2/5/17



Richard D. Russell Manager, Grievance Section Office of Legal Affairs

FEB 28 2017

Date Mailed

Ref. # 25880

C: Warden

Regional Health Care Administrator
Grievant

Southern

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

4835-4248 5/09

PRISONER/PAROLEE GRIEVANCE APPEAL FORM

CSJ-247B

Date Received by Grievance Coordinator
at Step II: 11-16-16

Grievance Identifier:

LCF/61100931/2D1**INSTRUCTIONS:** THIS FORM IS ONLY TO BE USED TO APPEAL A STEP I GRIEVANCE.

The white copy of the Prisoner/Parolee Grievance Form CSJ-247A (or the goldenrod copy if you have not been provided with a Step I response in a timely manner) **MUST** be attached to the white copy of this form if you appeal it at both Step II and Step III.

If you should decide to appeal the Step I grievance response to Step II, your appeal should be directed to:

6/c by 11-23-16. If it is not submitted by this date, it will be considered untimely.

If you should decide to appeal the response you receive at Step II, you should send your Step III Appeal to the Director's Office, P.O. Box 30003, Lansing, Michigan, 48909.

Name (Print first, last)	Number	Institution	Lock Number	Date of Incident	Today's Date
Keith Swift	202475	LCF	C-4-50	10-26-16	11-15-16

STEP II — Reason for Appeal**THE ISSUE WAS NOT RESOLVED AT STEP ONE MANDATING THIS APPEAL**

The reply simply provided a 'boiler plate language status' on the issue. The so called plan of care on 09-15-16 did not yield any type of medical assistance insofar as the 'resection of the colostomy operation' is concerned. Thus, the MP expertise and experience is not at issue in this grievance as the MP is not a surgeon, or specialist in 'colostomy treatment.' The delay in approving the colostomy operation is the issue here. The assertion that no health care encounter on 10-26-16, is misleading. I was very specific that Nurse Hill provided the information of the surgery denial procedure. This problem was known in 2011 and to date, I am still suffering. The delay is the deliberate indifference to my medical colostomy needs. The first step resolution is reiterated here. I need the colostomy operation to correct the problem. The court has ruled -- the delay in treatment is the deliberate indifference. cf *Hill v Marshall*, 962 F 2d 1209 (6th. Cir. 1991).

STEP II — ResponseDate Received by
Step II Respondent:*(See Attached)**S. A. Khan, RN/13**S. Antkowiak**11-23-16*

Respondent's Name (Print)

Respondent's Signature

Date

Date Returned to
Grievant:*11-30-16***STEP III — Reason for Appeal****ISSUE WAS NOT RESOLVED BELOW AND MANDATES THIS APPEAL TO ADDRESS THE DELAY**

The issue in this grievance was not fully addressed and the deliberate indifference to my medical needs continue. The reply admits that the surgery was scheduled back in 2011 and further admits that the 'colostomy problems' is evident. However, to save money the scheduled operation never occurred and I continue to suffer. The fact that 'blood and mucus' continues to fill the bag is evident that the problem needs correction. Contrary to the step two reply, I am not doing fine, if I was, I would not be suffering. Furthermore, as indicated, this is major surgery and the cost is delaying the matter. This delay may cause me more harm than the noted 'complications' listed in the reply. Moreover, I am not being provided all the 'special accommodations' I should have due to neglect by LCF's staff. **RESOLUTION:** My resolution is reiterated for this appeal and exhaustion process. This is a serious health care matter and the delay is the indifference which is, and has been condemned by the Courts. cf 42 USC § 1983.

NOTE: Only a copy of this appeal and the response will be returned to you.**STEP III — Director's Response is attached as a separate sheet.**

DISTRIBUTION: White – Process to Step III; Green, Canary, Pink – Process to Step II; Goldenrod – Grievant

Step II Grievance Appeal Response

Grievance Number: LCF 2016 11 0931 12D1
Prisoner Name: Swift, Keith
Prisoner Number: 202475

I have reviewed your Step I Grievance, the Step I Response, and your Step II Reason for Appeal.

SUMMARY OF STEP I COMPLAINT: Inmate is grieving medical, his allegation is that the health care and the Medical Provider (MP) denied surgery to reverse colostomy. Date of incident 10/26/16.	
SUMMARY OF STEP I RESPONSE: The allegation presented in this grievance has been reviewed by health care staff. Review of the Electronic Health Record (EHR) shows that the Grievant had no health care encounter on 10/26/16. It was noted during the investigation that the Grievant was seen by the MP on 9/15/16 where a plan of care established; which included submitting a 407 requesting visit to Gastroenterology to consult reversal of colostomy. This request was deferred on 9/22/16 due to medical necessity was not demonstrated at the time. The Grievant was notified of the deferral at his last chronic care visit. According to the MP expertise and experience, plan of care has been established and not agreeing with the plan of care does not support a grievance of denied health care needs. This grievance is considered denied. Grievant has received and will continue to receive all medical care necessary. Date of response 11/9/16.	
SUMMARY OF STEP II REASON FOR APPEAL: Grievant alleges the issue was not resolved at Step I mandating this appeal. The reply simply provided a "boiler plate language status" on the issue. The so called plan of care on 9/15/16 did not yield any type of medical assistance insofar as the 'resection of the colostomy operation' is concerned. Thus, the MP expertise and experience is not at issue in this grievance as the MP is not a surgeon, or specialist in 'colostomy treatment.' The delay in approving the colostomy operation is the issue here. The assertion that no health care encounter on 10/26/16, is misleading. I was very specific that Nurse Hill provided the information of the surgery denial procedure. This problem was known in 2011 and to date, I am still suffering. The delay is the deliberate indifference to my medical colostomy needs. The first step resolution is reiterated here. I need the colostomy operation to correct the problem. The court has ruled -- the delay in treatment is the deliberate indifference (names court case). Date of incident 10/26/16.	
SUMMARY OF STEP II INVESTIGATION: Upon investigation of the EHR (Electronic Health Records) on 8/4/11 the MP requests a surgery consultation for LLQ colostomy which was placed on 6/2/11 s/p colon resection for intramural abscess in the setting of chronic constipation, hemochromatosis, and poorly controlled hypertension. The MP notes the patient is doing well and there are no current complications. The consult was not approved as it was not medically necessary.	
On 11/27/13 the request for a surgery consult for colostomy reversal was readdressed. The MP notes medical history of diverticulitis and subsequent colostomy in about 6/2011 while a prisoner in Marquette. Occasional blood and mucus in colostomy bag. Requesting surgery evaluation for reversal of colostomy. The consult was not approved as it there was no demonstration of medical necessity at this time, a colostomy only reversed if there is a medical necessity.	
Grievant was evaluated by MP on 9/15/16, as indicated in the Step I Grievance response above. The MP submitted a request for approval to send Mr. Swift to gastroenterology for a consult regarding colostomy reversal. The MP notes Mr. Swift had diverticulitis and ended up with complications and colostomy placed approximately 2011-2012 while a prisoner in Marquette, re-anastomosis was to take place approx. 3 months after original placement. He has not had follow up. He has a significant medical history including, DM, HTN, Hyperlipidemia and cardiomyopathy. Occasional blood and mucus in colostomy bag. The consult was deferred, as the medical necessity is not demonstrated at this time. Continue to follow up on-site clinic by MP.	
Mr. Swift is doing fine with current condition, the surgery he is requesting is not a medical necessity, it is a major surgery with potential complication, which may include death. Without medical necessity this surgery is considered an elective procedure; the MDOC will not consider a major surgery that is not medically necessary. Mr. Swift is being monitored for his medical needs, and is issued supplies for his colostomy care. Grievant has and will continue to receive all necessary medical treatment. Grievant is encouraged to access health care through the Health Care Request (HCR)/kite process to address any current health care concerns and to constructively discuss his concerns with Health Care Staff at scheduled appointments.	
CONCLUSION: Evidence	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD 03.02.130, Prisoner Grievances • Policy 03.04.100 Health Care Services 	
Grievance Denied: Review of the evidence supports that Grievant's medical needs are being addressed.	
RESPONDENT NAME: Subrina Aiken, RN	TITLE: Clinical Administrative Assistant Jackson Health Care Office Administration
RESPONDENT SIGNATURE: <i>Subrina Aiken, RN</i>	DATE: 11/23/16

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
PRISONER/PAROLEE GRIEVANCE FORM4835-4247 10/94
CSJ-247ADate Received at Step I 11-2-16 Grievance Identifier: 2CF16110093112D1**Be brief and concise in describing your grievance issue.** If you have any questions concerning the grievance procedure, refer to PD 03.02.130 and OP 03.02.130 available in the prison Law Library.

Name (print first, last) Keith Swift	Number 202475	Institution LCF	Lock Number C-4-50	Date of Incident 10-26-16	Today's Date 10-31-16
---	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------

What attempt did you make to resolve this issue prior to writing this grievance? On what date? _____
If none, explain why.

The denial of medical treatment could not be resolved or addressed because I have no access to the Doctor, or Corizon Medical Service who is responsible for denying the specific medical procedure/operation to correct my serious medical need. This grievance is the sole remedy to address the delay/denial of treatment amounting to deliberate indifference.

State problem clearly. Use separate grievance form for each issue. Additional pages, using plain paper, may be used. Four copies of each page and supporting documents must be submitted with this form. The grievance must be submitted to the Grievance Coordinator in accordance with the time limits of OP 03.02.130.

DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO MY MEDICAL NEEDS BY DELAYING AND DENYING MEDICAL TREATMENT TO SAVE MONEY

On 10-26-16, I was informed by Nurse Practitioner Hill that Lansing, (Dr. Adam Eldeman, MD, and Corizon Medical Service) denied the medical procedure -Surgery Resection of Colostomy- to correct my medical problem. I was informed that N.P. Hill would keep trying to get the procedure approved. Because the procedure is costly, both Dr. Eldeman and Corizon Medical Service has elected to save money by denying the medical procedure and treatment needed to correct my medical problem of 'resection of the colostomy' to allow my intestines to heal properly. This is, and has been, an ongoing medical problem since 2011. The delay in approving the specific 'resection of the colostomy' has caused more harm to my intestines and digestive tract. The possibility of further surgery was known to Dr. Eldeman; Dr. Squire, and Corizon as far back as 2011. I have not had the corrective follow up care from the initial operation which has created a severe problem with the 'colostomy.' The delay and denial in approving the operation constitutes deliberate indifference to my serious medical needs and violates MDOC medical policy and my constitutional right to receive adequate medical care while confined under the MDOC's supervision: **RESOLUTION** I request that the approval of the surgery for resection of my colostomy be done immediately to assist in the proper healing of my intestines and stomach problems. Moreover, per PD-03.02.130, any mode of retaliation is prohibited and any such retaliatory tactics, no matter how slight for submitting this grievance, will be grounds for litigation pursuant to Title 42 USC § 1983. *Accord, Spruytte v Hoffner*, 181 F Supp 2d 736 (W.D. Mich. 2002). As a prisoner, I have a constitutional right to receive adequate medical treatment while confined. *Cf. Estelle v Gamble*, 429 US 97, 104 (1976).

Swift, Keith 202475 10/31/16
Grievant's Signature

RESPONSE (Grievant Interviewed?) ☒ Yes ☐ No If No, give explanation. If resolved, explain resolution.)See attached

RECEIVED
LAKE AND CORRECTIONAL
2016 NOV -3 PM 12:47
HEALTH CARE

<u>Rider RW13</u> Respondent's Signature	<u>11/9/16</u> Date	<u>G. Burch MA</u> Reviewer's Signature	<u>11/10/16</u> Date
<u>Rider</u> Respondent's Name (Print)	<u>RW13</u> Working Title	<u>G. Burch MA</u> Reviewer's Name (Print)	<u>Unit Chief</u> Working Title

Date Returned to

Grievant:

11-10-16

If resolved at Step I, Grievant sign here.

Resolution must be described above.

Grievant's Signature

Date

Step I Grievance Response

Grievance Number:	LCF 2016-11-0931-12D1
Prisoner Name:	Swift, Keith
Prisoner Number:	202475

Prisoner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	was	<input type="checkbox"/>	was NOT interviewed. GIVE REASON:	
----------	-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

11/9/16

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT:

Inmate is grieving medical, his allegation is that the Healthcare and the Medical Provider (MP) denied surgery to reverse colostomy.

INVESTIGATION INFORMATION

The allegation presented in this grievance has been reviewed by healthcare staff. Review of the electronic medical record (EMR) shows that the grievant had no healthcare encounters on 10/26/16. It was noted during the investigation that the grievant was seen by the Medical Provider (MP) on 9/15/16 where a plan of care established; which included submitting a 407 requesting visit to Gastroenterology to consult reversal of colostomy. This request was deferred on 9/22/16 due to medical necessity was not demonstrated at the time. The grievant was notified of the deferral at his last chronic care visit. According to the MP expertise and experience, plan of care has been established and not agreeing with the plan of care does not support a grievance of denied healthcare needs. This grievance is considered denied.

APPLICABLE POLICY, PROCEDURE, ETC.

PD 03.04.100 Health Services

SUMMARY

Grievant has received and will continue to receive all medical care necessary to meet his medical needs.

RESPONDENT NAME:	Rhonda Rider, RN	TITLE:	RN13
RESPONDENT SIGNATURE:	<i>Rhonda Rider RN13</i>	DATE:	11/9/16
REVIEWER NAME:	Gail Burch, Mental Health Unit Chief	TITLE:	MH Unit Chief
REVIEWER SIGNATURE:	<i>GBurch MA</i>	DATE:	11/10/16

Step III Grievance Response

KEITH SWIFT 202475

JCF 14010186

Grievant alleges she is inappropriately being denied a colostomy reversal.

All relevant information within the electronic medical record has been reviewed. Step I and Step II appropriately addressed this grievance and are affirmed at the Step III appeal.

Grievance appeal denied.

Response of Bureau of Health Care Services

Date: 4/18/2014

Approved: _____


S. Laughhunn, RN

Date: _____

4.18.14



Richard D. Russell Manager, Grievance Section Office of Legal Affairs

APR 24 2014

Date Mailed

Ref. # 20278

C: Warden

Regional Health Care Administrator

Southern

Grievant

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
PRISONER/PAROLEE GRIEVANCE APPEAL FORM

4835-4248 5/09
CSJ-247B

Date Received by Grievance Coordinator
at Step II: 2/10/14

Grievance Identifier: JCF/401/086/203

INSTRUCTIONS: THIS FORM IS ONLY TO BE USED TO APPEAL A STEP I GRIEVANCE.

The white copy of the Prisoner/Parolee Grievance Form CSJ-247A (or the goldenrod copy if you have not been provided with a Step I response in a timely manner) **MUST** be attached to the white copy of this form if you appeal it at both Step II and Step III.

If you should decide to appeal the Step I grievance response to Step II, your appeal should be directed to: OC by 2/11/14. If it is not submitted by this date, it will be considered terminated. Office of Legal Affairs

If you should decide to appeal the response you receive at Step II, you should send your Step III Appeal to the Director's Office, P.O. Box 30003, Lansing, Michigan, 48909.

Name (Print first, last)	Number	Institution	Lock Number	Date of Incident	Today's Date
KEITH SWIFT	202475	J.C.F	C-24	1-20-14	2-7-14

STEP II — Reason for Appeal ALL ISSUES AND PARTIES FROM STEP I
CARRY OVER TO STEP II.

STEP II — Response

Date Received by
Step II Respondent: VA
02-12-2014

See attached

LAURA KINDER, MCAA Laura Kinder MCAA 02/14/2014
Respondent's Name (Print) Respondent's Signature Date

Date Returned to
Grievant: 2/18/14

STEP III — Reason for Appeal

All issues and parties from step I and step II
carry over to step III.

NOTE: Only a copy of this appeal and the response will be returned to you.

STEP III — Director's Response is attached as a separate sheet.

DISTRIBUTION: White – Process to Step III; Green, Canary, Pink – Process to Step II; Goldenrod – Grievant

Step II Grievance Appeal Response

Grievance Number:	JCF 14 01 0186 12d3
Prisoner Name:	SWIFT
Prisoner Number:	202475

I have reviewed your Step I Grievance, the Step I Response, and your Step II Reason for Appeal.

SUMMARY OF STEP I COMPLAINT: Grievant complains "Grievant has a colostomy bag that was supposed to be reversed. Despite a Specialist's diagnosis and recommendation, noting to medical staff and Corizon, the colostomy is having adverse affects on Grievants current and future health and quality of life. These actions violate the Eighth Amendment, subjecting grievant to pain and suffering. Resolution: An investigation into why JCF medical staff have and are displaying deliberate indifference to grievants medical needs. Identify any deficiencies in this grievance or consider them waived under 42 U.S.C. 1997 e."

SUMMARY OF STEP I RESPONSE: Complete, see attached.

SUMMARY OF STEP II REASON FOR APPEAL: Grievant indicates that this issue has not been resolved.

SUMMARY OF STEP II INVESTIGATION: Upon investigation of the EMR (electronic medical record), 12/10/2013- Medical Provider (MP) appointment, patient informed deferral of colostomy reversal as there was no current necessity to perform this surgery.

CONCLUSION: Evidence

- Policy 03.04.100 Health Care Services
- Policy 03.02.130 Prisoner/Parolee Grievances

The issue presented in this grievance has been reviewed by health care staff. Prisoners shall be provided with a continuum of medically necessary health care services that are supported by evidence based medical research. Grievant is being evaluated, treated, diagnostic testing conducted and monitored by the Medical Provider (MP). Prisoners shall be provided with a continuum of medically necessary health care services that are supported by evidence based medical research. The MP is responsible for determining the most appropriate course of treatment for his patients taking into consideration all information available. The MP's treatment plan for the grievant demonstrates that was done in this case. A disagreement with the medical judgment of the MP does not support a claim that the treatment plan is inappropriate.

Grievant is encouraged to access health care through the kite process to address any current health care concerns.

- Grievance: Denied.

RESPONDENT NAME: Laura Kinder, RN	TITLE: Clinical Administrative Assistant Southern Region Health Care Administration
RESPONDENT SIGNATURE: <i>Laura Kinder, RN</i>	DATE: 02/14/2014

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
PRISONER/PAROLEE GRIEVANCE FORM4835-4247 10/94
CSJ-247ADate Received at Step I 4/22/14Grievance Identifier: 500 401001810203

Be brief and concise in describing your grievance issue. If you have any questions concerning the grievance procedure, refer to PD 03.02.130 and OP 03.02.130 available in the prison Law Library.

Name (print first, last)	Number	Institution	Lock Number	Date of Incident	Today's Date
Keith Swift	202475	JCF	C-24	1-20-14	1-21-14

What attempt did you make to resolve this issue prior to writing this grievance? On what date? _____

If none, explain why.

This grievance is against all JCF Health Service staff, all doctors and nurses and Corizon. Grievant can not present all names specifically because of an inability to access files. JCF medical staff collectively have displayed deliberate indifference to Grievant's serious medical needs. Grievant tried to resolve matters herein by speaking with JCF medical staff on 1-20-14 with no resolution. This is all the information "available" to grievant.

State problem clearly. Use separate grievance form for each issue. Additional pages, using plain paper, may be used. Four copies of each page and supporting documents must be submitted with this form. The grievance must be submitted to the Grievance Coordinator in accordance with the time limits of OP 03.02.130.

Grievant has a colostomy bag that was supposed to be reversed. Despite a Specialist's diagnosis and recommendation, noting to JCF medical staff and Corizon, the colostomy is having adverse affects on Grievant's current and future health, and quality of life. These actions violate the Eighth Amendment, subjecting Grievant to pain and suffering. **Resolution:** An investigation into why JCF medical staff have and are displaying deliberate indifference to grievant's medical needs. Identify any deficiencies in this grievance or consider them waived under 42 U.S.C. § 1997 e.

Grievance mailed to JCF Grievance Coordinator on 1-21-14 @ 1800.

Swift Keith 202475
Grievant's Signature

RESPONSE (Grievant Interviewed?) ☐ Yes ☐ No If No, give explanation. If resolved, explain resolution.)

Respondent's Signature MT CullingDate 4/29/14

Reviewer's Signature _____

Date _____

Respondent's Name (Print) _____

Working Title _____

Reviewer's Name (Print) _____

Working Title _____

Date Returned to
Grievant: 4/1/14

If resolved at Step I, Grievant sign here.
Resolution must be described above.

Grievant's Signature _____

Date _____

Step I Grievance Response**Grievance Number:**

JCF-2014-01-0186-12D3

Prisoner Name:

Swift

Prisoner Number:

202475

Prisoner☐

was

☐

was NOT interviewed. GIVE REASON:

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT:

Grievant alleges that he has a colostomy that was supposed to be reversed per the specialist's diagnosis and recommendation but JCF medical staff and Corizon are refusing to allow this to be done. He alleges the colostomy is having adverse affects on his current and future health, and quality of life.

INVESTIGATION INFORMATION

Grievant was interviewed and his electronic medical record reviewed. On 11/27/13, his medical provider (MP) requested through a 407 that the grievant have a surgical evaluation for reversal of colostomy. On 12/9/13 the reviewer responded with an alternate treatment plan of Medical necessity not demonstrated at the present time. We typically do not reverse colostomies unless it is medical necessary. After reviewing the MP visits from 10/22/13 and 11/25/13, there were no issues with the colostomy that were documented by the MP, therefore, there is no need for a reversal of the colostomy at this time.

APPLICABLE POLICY, PROCEDURE, ETC.

PD.03.04.101 Health Services.

SUMMARY

Grievance denied. Grievant is encouraged to access health care through the health care request for any current health concerns.

RESPONDENT NAME:

M. Couling

TITLE:

RN

RESPONDENT SIGNATURE:*M. Couling***DATE:**

1/29/14

REVIEWER NAME:

K. Hamblin

TITLE:

RN

REVIEWER SIGNATURE:*K. Hamblin***DATE:**

1/30/14